

1 This is a practical matter for Marin County.
2 There have been several proposals made by various local
3 community groups in the past to address real problems
4 that Marin County faces.

5 Some of the key issues that come to mind are
6 housing, transportation and small rehabilitation
7 facilities, as I mentioned.

8 Housing shortage and the lack of affordable
9 housing in Marin County is a very big problem.

10 The San Quentin site is an ideal location for
11 multiple housing development, including low income
12 housing badly needed in Marin.

13 These proposals are not an effort to line the
14 pockets of developers, like I have heard it said by
15 proponents of expansion of the prison, but to address a
16 housing crisis of escalating proportions in Marin.

17 The San Quentin site is also a unique
18 opportunity to provide a transportation hub for light
19 rail commuting along the north bay corridor from
20 Cloverdale to San Francisco.

21 Proponents of the transportation initiative
22 believe that this site can be used as a light rail to
23 ferry connector, allowing commuters an alternate route
24 from Sonoma County to San Francisco, bypassing the
25 already overburdened and frequently backed-up Highway

1 101 corridor.

2 We support -- we'd like to say that we support
3 all the efforts for rehabilitation for prisons, creating
4 humane conditions and surrounding environments for the
5 inmates and developing programs to change the course of
6 prison life for the better.

7 So this is not about opposing these programs or
8 the support groups. This is about a practical concern
9 for Marin County.

10 The cost of rebuilding the prison is said to be
11 around 220 million dollars. But estimates are always
12 off and I can't believe that the size and scope proposed
13 in the EIR will come in that low.

14 The EIR does not even address cost of
15 renovations and upgrades of the existing facilities.

16 Furthermore, the proposal depicts some of the
17 ugliest and most embarrassing architecture one could
18 imagine anywhere, period.

19 The proposal presents big, ugly, yellow boxes
20 facing the Bay, visible by commuters over the bridge
21 and sightseers by passing boats as well as the ferry.

22 EDAW has not proposed as of yet an esthetically
23 pleasing design that would pass muster on any of the 12
24 planning commissions in the county.

25 Why should this project be any different?

1 The State needs to look very closely at its proposal and
2 come up with alternative locations for the expansion and
3 allow Marin County the opportunity to solve some very
4 serious problems it's presently faced with.

5 Thank you very much.

6 MS. DANIELS: All right, thank you. Next we
7 have Sue Severin. She is with the Death Penalty Focus.

8 MS. SEVERIN: Thank you. Yes. My name is Sue
9 Severin. And I'm the Chair of the Marin Chapter of the
10 Death Penalty Focus/California People of Faith Working
11 Against The Death Penalty.

12 I want to start by saying I'm totally opposed
13 to the Death Penalty. I find it interesting that a
14 commission has just been set up which will be studying
15 capital punishment, specifically the death penalty,
16 making their report in three years, at approximately the
17 time that the new Death Row would be finished, if it
18 went ahead.

19 My hope is that the death penalty will simply
20 be abolished;

21 That there will be a moratorium and no death
22 penalty whatsoever.

23 In the meantime, here in Marin where, when
24 people are executed, there are many people, a minimum of
25 600 people showing up. And there will be more than that

1 in the future.

2 So my question to you, focusing on the EIR
3 report is: What kind of arrangements have you made for
4 them?

5 Somebody has pointed out the new Death Row
6 would be on the west side of the prison, which makes it
7 sensible that people would be approaching from the west
8 side.

9 Where is the room for all of those people who
10 are going to be there any time there is an execution
11 scheduled?

12 Thank you.

13 MS. DANIELS: Thank you. Next we have Victor
14 Gonzales. He's with Monahan Pacific?

15 MR. GONZALEZ: Correct. My name is Victor
16 Gonzalez. I'm with the development company called
17 Monahan Pacific. We are your neighbor. You are our
18 neighbor.

19 I'd like to make four points, if I could. And
20 I'd like to say to the folks in this room and at the
21 legislature who would like San Quentin to be moved or
22 Death Row to be put somewhere else, all you have to do
23 is change the legislation.

24 And I urge everybody to go do that, rather than
25 complain about it in front of an EIR; just change a few

1 words.

2 In terms of the document's accuracy, I don't
3 think it discusses the project -- the neighboring
4 project currently under construction, 23 homes.

5 And that would be in Exhibits 1-1 and four,
6 4-1. The project map should indicate that residential
7 development comes right up to the property line.

8 A city park comes right up to the property
9 line. That would be Miwok Park in Larkspur.

10 Exhibit 4.1-4 (a) through 4 (c) are pictures of
11 the existing conditions. Those pictures are old.

12 As of June, we were under construction and that
13 -- those sets of pictures are no longer accurate.

14 So I would urge you in the final to show the
15 construction that's already occurred.

16 And I think EDAW would have access to the
17 visual simulations we did as part of our environmental
18 evaluation, which could probably be put into that
19 simulation pretty easily.

20 But, in point of fact, we will be having people
21 living within, I'm going to guess, a quarter mile of
22 this facility.

23 So the lighting, the architecture, all the
24 things that people are talking about will not be
25 somewhere far away. It will be very close.

1 A couple of questions that I'd like addressed
2 that I'm not clear on is what is the basis of making the
3 decision between the first story and the second story
4 alternative and who is making that and what's the basis?

5 Is it driven by environmental considerations?

6 Is it driven by economic considerations?

7 And I think that could probably be answered in
8 a fairly straight-forward way.

9 And is it my impression that this is the last
10 time the public has input into those decisions? In
11 other words, we close the comment period in a couple of
12 weeks or a week.

13 I'm assuming that there are no other public
14 hearings; that this is something that the director
15 decides, based on whatever criteria the Department wants
16 to use.

17 So if that's not the case, I'd like that
18 straightened out, too.

19 I guess the third area is mitigation, which a
20 lot of people have talked about. And I guess I'll talk
21 to my CEQA attorney.

22 But I think I've been told in other situations
23 that in the case of unavoidable significant impacts,
24 where you do have feasible ways to reduce those impacts,
25 I think you're obligated to do that.

1 And I'll check that out. But, for instance,
2 the very simple suggestions about lighting, massing,
3 screening, different types of fences, berms,
4 landscaping, these are very common and usually very
5 cost-effective ways to make a huge mass go away.

6 I like the idea of motion detectors and using
7 new technologies that might limit the lighting all day.

8 And I get my flex-your-power things all the
9 time about the State's commitment to conserving power.
10 So it might work that way, too.

11 In terms of massing, there is just a ton of
12 things that you can do with varieties of shapes, colors,
13 size, materials. I just hope that's on the drawing
14 board and in the budget.

15 And I would like to echo the last comment
16 because I didn't see a discussion of the relocation of
17 the public protest and how there might be impacts from
18 that activity.

19 I think it will be at the west gate. It will
20 be close to our future homeowners and I'd like a
21 discussion of it. Thank you.

22 MS. DANIELS: All right, thank you, Victor.
23 We've got two more representatives from organizations
24 that will speak and then we'll get to the individuals
25 that want to speak.

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 And we probably have about 15 more speakers so
2 -- and if we need to take a break, we can do that, too.
3 How is everybody doing? -- okay?

4 Okay. Our next speaker is Don Wilhelm. He is
5 with MCL.

6 MR. WILHELM: Good evening. I'm Don Wilhelm.
7 I am the chairman of the transportation committee for
8 the Marin Conservation League.

9 The comments this evening are preliminary and
10 we'll follow up with a written document.

11 We believe that many aspects of the EIR section
12 4.12 transportation is inadequate. The EIR contains
13 confusing numerical information and lacks important data
14 relating to the traffic impacts, due to the expansion
15 and the construction of the CIC.

16 A number of specific items I'll mention:

17 Firstly, roadways that were affected by the
18 project traffic. We believe that the intersection, the
19 northbound intersection of Highway 101 and I-580 should
20 be included in the EIR study.

21 Although this intersection is not directly
22 adjacent to the CIC, it is directly impacted by the CIC
23 traffic.

24 The reasoning should be the same as that was
25 applied to evaluating Highway 101 at Sir Francis Drake.

1 Also, the EIR, to provide meaningful data for
2 current and future traffic conditions, it is necessary
3 to tabulate traffic volumes through each intersection
4 for all conditions.

5 The traffic volumes for existing traffic and
6 background traffic are shown in Exhibits 4.12.5 and
7 4.12.8, respectively.

8 But there is no similar exhibit that covers the
9 project traffic nor construction traffic.

10 The tables indicate that many of the major
11 intersections, particularly relating to Highway 101 and
12 Sir Francis Drake, are operating at level of service C.

13 Persons passing through the peak northbound
14 Highway 101 to Sir Francis Drake interchange observe
15 considerable congestion, particularly this evening,
16 which was, unfortunately, quite typical.

17 The EIR should explain how the observable
18 congestion that backs up onto 101 can be tabulated as a
19 level of service C.

20 If this intersection was at level C, why is
21 Larkspur spending thousands of dollars to improve Sir
22 Francis Drake and why has the CMA, Congestion Management
23 Agency, made it the number one project for the regional
24 measure two funds to spend tens of millions of dollars
25 to revamp the entire interchange?

1 The EIR should include a comparison of the
2 traffic study results used by Larkspur and Caltrans to
3 justify their massive projects.

4 Table four, twelve and five requires
5 clarification.

6 And a.m. peak table shows that the trip rate
7 per employee is 0.11. How is this rate determined?

8 Is it the entire a.m. period or per hour?

9 What is the size, as define in the table? Is
10 this the number of employees traveling at this time?

11 Is it a per hour or for the entire period?

12 If the size and rates have been the same units
13 of measure, it would imply that the employees are coming
14 in vans or busses of ten or more persons per trip.

15 This is very confusing. And all the tables
16 that relate to this information should be defined units
17 of measures so that it can be more easily understood.

18 Traffic patterns shown in Exhibit 14.12-11
19 should include traffic volumes in addition to the
20 percentages shown.

21 Also similar exhibits should be for
22 construction traffic as needed.

23 The timing of the construction traffic relating
24 to the CIC should be reviewed against the likely timing
25 of the Richmond San Rafael Bridge, including the

1 replacement of the deck, all phases of the San Rafael
2 gap enclosure, Larkspur's widening of Sir Francis Drake
3 and the construction of the new interchange at 101 and
4 Sir Francis Drake.

5 The timing of these project overlaps is
6 critical in that if it coincides with the CIC
7 construction, the impacts will be greater than their
8 separate impacts.

9 The EIR is totally silent on the traffic
10 impacts resulting from the construction activity.
11 These impacts should be evaluated in the same manner as
12 the project traffic.

13 The trip distribution for the construction
14 traffic must be determined. It will be different than
15 employment distribution.

16 If a high percentage of trips are destined for
17 Marin, Contra Costa or Sonoma Counties' gravel, asphalt
18 and concrete suppliers, the impact of these trips should
19 be determined along the entire route through and into
20 these counties.

21 Regarding the mitigations: The EIR should
22 include a traffic study of the proposed traffic signal
23 at the Main Street and I-580 interchange.

24 The traffic light at this location is going to
25 create surges of traffic entering Highway 580.

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 There is a very limited distance for the
2 acceleration lane. And will this surge of traffic cause
3 backups in the main stream and possibly result in
4 accidents?

5 Does this acceleration lane meet the Caltrans
6 standards? Should this intersection have metering
7 lights?

8 MS. DANIELS: Uh, Don, I see you have got a
9 couple of more pages there --

10 MR. WILHELM: Just one.

11 MS. DANIELS: Okay, thank you.

12 MR. WILHELM: The construction-related traffic
13 impacts, the EIR should determine what the maximum trips
14 should be allowed to avoid regional congestion.

15 The contractor should provide mitigations to
16 control the trips to a prescribed level. This would
17 include providing park and ride lots close to the
18 residences of the workers.

19 Vans could be provided, where necessary. Safe
20 storage of workers' tools and belongings should be
21 provided so that to eliminate the necessity of the
22 workers carrying their tools home every day.

23 The details of trip counts and workers and the
24 number of freight hauling trucks should be defined for
25 the entire duration of the construction project.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. DANIELS: Thank you. Are you going to
3 submit these written comments to us?

4 MR. WILHELM: Yes.

5 MS. DANIELS: Okay, thank you very much.

6 Next, we have a representative from the Friends
7 Of Smart. I think it's Walter?

8 MR. STRAKOSCH: My name is Walter Strakosch.
9 I'm with the Friends Of Smart, which is a Sonoma Marin
10 Area Rail Transit group, with hopes in the future of
11 having a terminal at San Quentin, a ferry terminal and a
12 rail terminal at San Quentin.

13 In the executive summary of the San Quentin
14 DEIR, it states: "Condemned inmates are legislatively
15 mandated to be housed and ultimately executed at San
16 Quentin."

17 That's section 3603 of the California Penal
18 Code.

19 We are talking about prison buildings that have
20 been built between the years 1852 and 1934; some that
21 are over 150 years old.

22 There is no question that changes in
23 modernization must be made. It is over-crowded and
24 out-dated.

25 The question, then, is: Is there a better

1 place and a better way of doing this than to remodel
2 and/or rebuild these structures at its present location
3 and not address the entity EIR.

4 I, along with, I would imagine, a majority of
5 the citizens of Marin County, believe there is a better
6 way.

7 There is no doubt in my mind that the San
8 Quentin property can be put to a higher and better use:
9 Residential, including below market rate housing, some
10 commercial and a bus, rail and ferry terminal.

11 This would be a win-win situation for Marin
12 County and the State to move a prison that is now a
13 decrepit bunch of buildings to another location that
14 would be about as convenient for attorneys or other
15 organizations to confer with their clients as San
16 Quentin is today.

17 There is approximately 80 miles of open space
18 between Oakland and Sacramento where a prison and Death
19 Row could be located and not be in anyone's backyard.

20 It would eliminate any environmental objections
21 about visual and waste water impacts that Marin might
22 have.

23 And carrying this further, about what Joe
24 Nation said with regard to costs, an article in the San
25 Francisco Chronicle of October 27th states:

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 "The value of this property today is about 465
2 million dollars, if it was sold."

3 It goes on to say: "That the cost today to
4 replace San Quentin would be about 802 million dollars
5 or a difference of 337 million to build a new prison."

6 It takes, according to the Marin IJ, in an
7 article of October 14th, the year 2001, 30 million
8 dollars more a year to operate San Quentin over a more
9 modern prison.

10 If that be the case, it would take only eleven
11 to twelve more years of operating San Quentin to make up
12 the difference of 337 million.

13 After that, the taxpayers are ahead by at least
14 30 million a year.

15 It seems to me to be a no-brainer. Add to
16 that, of the 1,612 present prison employees, at least
17 938 or 58 percent are located in counties that are more
18 convenient to prison locations in Solano, Contra Costa
19 or Sacramento Counties as opposed to Marin.

20 This number would probably increase by another
21 86 as the new Death Row would use the property of the
22 on-site housing that is presently used by these prison
23 employees bringing the percentage up to 63.5.

24 Politics being politics, things, of course, are
25 not that simple. But we do have a state that is in a

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 real financial pickle and a new governor, who is
2 supposedly fiscally prudent.

3 We should certainly confer with him as to how
4 much sense and how much money can be saved by the
5 relocation and the rebuilding of San Quentin at a
6 different but convenient location for visitation and how
7 much fiscal sense it makes to do so.

8 We should also gain his influence to change
9 section 3603 of the Penal Code, which is, apparently, a
10 big stumbling block to any movement of San Quentin.

11 Marin has developed the San Quentin re-use
12 plan, which includes an outstanding residential
13 development on the water's edge and could very much
14 make the County proud.

15 It would be a showplace. In addition, a bus,
16 ferry and rail terminal could be located there. The
17 ferry ride to downtown San Francisco from San Quentin
18 would be 20 minutes or ten minutes less than it is
19 from Larkspur today.

20 You could not drive from there to downtown San
21 Francisco in that time, whether it's rush or non-rush
22 hour.

23 There would be about 100,000 more people in
24 Marin and Sonoma Counties by the year 2015.

25 Mobility is an issue now and will be more of an

1 issue by that time.

2 Shouldn't we try to put politics aside and do
3 what is right, at least for the majority of the citizens
4 of Marin and Sonoma Counties?

5 Thank you.

6 MS. DANIELS: Thank you.

7 We're going to take about another five-minute
8 break. We've got about 14 additional speakers that want
9 to come and talk.

10 We need to give the court reporter a little bit
11 of a break. So we'll reconvene in about five minutes.
12 Thank you.

13 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

14 MS. DANIELS: We need to get started. I have
15 Robert Lafore.

16 MR. LAFORE: I'm Robert Lafore and I live at
17 173 Summit. And, like a lot of people, I have a view
18 out of the windows of my house of the prison.

19 I think one of the things that the EIR doesn't
20 speak to is the visual effect that -- the project looks
21 to me like it's almost going to double the size of the
22 area, which is covered by an active part of the prison.

23 This has quite a visual impact on those of us
24 who live in the surrounding hills and can see the prison
25 24 hours a day.

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 I notice that you talked a lot about what
2 people are looking at when they drive by in their car
3 and leave the ferry boat.

4 But that's a very minor point because those
5 people aren't there very long. I think the EIR should
6 cover what the impact is on those of us who can see it
7 from a distance.

8 MS. DANIELS: Thank you.

9 Next, we have a Joyce Bonifield.

10 MS. BONIFIELD: Hello. I'm Joyce Bonifield.
11 Thank you for letting me speak.

12 My first reaction to the environmental report
13 is that it's totally insufficient. If they start
14 putting those buildings up there, I think it's going to
15 set the course for many, many, many millions of more
16 dollars because that old prison is just not -- it's not
17 fit for humans to be there.

18 I think that they must not look at the same
19 traffic that I look at. When I look out my windows,
20 which I'm very close to San Quentin and I also see the
21 Sir Francis Drake, there is bumper-to-bumper until 7:30
22 at night.

23 And it's going to remain that way. There is
24 going to be much more work done on that bridge.

25 The wetlands -- we do have endangered species

1 in those wetlands and those lights are going to affect
2 them. It just has to.

3 If we lose the hawks, then the population of
4 mice is just going to triple. There are many, many
5 hawks in that area. That electrofied fence will kill
6 them, of course, on contact.

7 And another point that I have is that there is
8 no place for the staff to live. There just is no place
9 for them to live. So they have to commute.

10 And that's an inhumane thing to do to people;
11 have them on the road an hour to get to work, an hour to
12 get home.

13 You know, they're not fit for family life by
14 the time they get home.

15 And I was told by a staff person for the
16 Corrections Department that they tried to put this at
17 Vacaville but the people had a big fit.

18 However, Vacaville does have a stake in it.
19 That town exists because of the prison over there.

20 So I think it should be put somewhere, where it
21 doesn't have the impact that it does at San Quentin.

22 Having the largest Death Row in the world right
23 in one's face is a really discouraging thing.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. DANIELS: Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 Next, we have a Linda Bundy.

2 MS. BUNDY: Hi. Linda Bundy, B-u-n-d-y.

3 I've been living across -- I live on the Bay
4 side of Corte Madera. I've been living across from the
5 prison for 26 years, looking at it and the proliferation
6 of lighting over the years and thinking about it.

7 And, basically, I guess a lot of people would
8 all like to see it just go away and turn into a
9 wonderful park.

10 And I know that's not going to happen. But
11 some of the things that do concern me: In the EIR
12 I think that you didn't respond to the problem relating
13 to the maximum capacity of the new CIC being reached in
14 approximately 20 years.

15 The estimate of 25 to 40 new prisoners on Death
16 Row each year, the CGS said 40 that's -- and going in,
17 would fill the place up in 20 years.

18 And then what do we do with further expansion
19 over there? It looks like this is a pretty crammed-in
20 site as it is.

21 I don't know why you aren't considering the
22 lifetime use of this, when there is only one execution
23 average every three years.

24 There has only been ten executions since 1976.
25 So we're just storing people, they could be stored

1 elsewhere.

2 Another thing that is sort of in -- some of the
3 people -- Ms. Lewen talked about, I don't think that the
4 EIR considered keeping the old prison as use for
5 rehabilitation and educational purposes and having a
6 smaller Death Row.

7 Maybe the original 68 site could be used to
8 maintain the actual Death Row and execution chamber
9 there, since no one else seems to want that, and have
10 the storage -- excuse me for using that word -- at
11 another site.

12 But if having the execution chamber there and
13 the actual execution as one of the main problems with
14 most of it going elsewhere, that could be changed, if
15 that site was rehabilitated.

16 And the rest of the site could be used in a
17 shared use with the region for something that would be
18 of benefit to the local and regional entities.

19 It seems like the EIR did not consider any
20 unique design for this site, rather the design is
21 standard prison design, given two choices: Single level
22 or stacked design.

23 Not even a combination was considered, which
24 would reduce the impact at the shoreline and keep its 57
25 employee housing units and could have landscaping.

1 There is two basketball courts in one of the --
2 I mean, this thing could be changed. It could be moved.
3 It could be combined.

4 There is no innovative thinking on this. And
5 the thought that Dairy Hill is considered in some sort
6 of -- that is a mess.

7 That's been chopped off on one end and there is
8 two shacks or sheds on it. So that -- rather than being
9 moved to another site or moved up to the old quarry site
10 could be used around the perimeter for berming and, at
11 least, putting in some landscaping to rehabilitate that
12 site.

13 Some of the thoughts that I had for if we keep
14 the old prison is -- let me just run through it really
15 quickly:

16 To change the level of prison to accommodate
17 the new goal of rehabilitation, education and training;
18 the potential to end double cells, if the prison limited
19 to inmates being phased out of the prison system by
20 means of preparing them for re-entry into society by
21 giving them education and work skills.

22 And use the current volunteer/education program
23 at San Quentin as a model to train personnel and expand
24 programs to other sites.

25 It could relocate the reception center to

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 several sites, rather than just two.

2 And I already mentioned the re-structuring of
3 Death Row to a limited amount.

4 The thing that has been very surprising to me
5 is that you could house the majority of the increasing
6 condemned populations at other Level 4 prisons.

7 I thought because of the way it's always been
8 talked about, that a condemned inmate facility like this
9 was something different.

10 It's just like the other level 4 prisons that
11 are being built today. And they're in other areas now.

12 So there is no -- there is nothing unique to
13 having it just for the condemned.

14 I think it would be good to provide a medical
15 facility over there and to maintain the current housing
16 for employees and to expand housing over there.

17 We need more housing. And it particularly
18 makes sense that the State would provide it for their
19 own employees, since only approximately 14 percent now
20 live in Marin.

21 And it would also reduce the financial
22 inducements to hiring new employees over there. It
23 seems they're talking about from one to \$7,000 a year to
24 get employees to even work in Marin.

25 Perhaps additional housing could be provided to

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 non-prison employees to provide revenue to the state or
2 needed housing in the area.

3 Also this would give the potential to
4 relocate the ferry terminal, provide better access and
5 service and would free up the old site for use for
6 housing or a transit center and also provide the
7 opportunity to restore the area from a seriously
8 degraded environment to one that's more appropriate to
9 this unique geographical setting.

10 Thank you.

11 MS. DANIELS: Thank you.

12 Next, we have a Kay Keohane.

13 MS. KEOHAN: It's Keohane. It's K-e-o-h-a-n-e.

14 MS. DANIELS: Thank you.

15 MS. KEOHAN: I'm a Corte Madera resident. I
16 live in east Corte Madera, directly across from San
17 Quentin.

18 And I wanted to thank you for the EIR. And I
19 think it told us what we needed to hear; that there will
20 be a significant, substantial and adverse change to the
21 physical environment.

22 So I think most projects, where an EIR was
23 done, where there would be significant, substantial and
24 adverse changes to the physical environment would be
25 nixed.

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 The planning commissions would say -- you know,
2 any project like this that would come to a planning
3 commission, the planning commission would immediately
4 throw it out.

5 I know that I couldn't build something like
6 this. I know that a shopping center couldn't build
7 something like this.

8 I know that affordable housing wouldn't build
9 something like this that would degrade the environment
10 in this manner.

11 There is no screening. There is no trees.
12 There is no light mitigation.

13 I can read in my bedroom by the lights of San
14 Quentin and now there is more lights proposed with
15 60-foot guard towers over there.

16 So I think that this is a very insensitive
17 project to the environment. And the EIR is telling us
18 that.

19 And I think the one thing that the EIR does not
20 address is that the old prison is still there.

21 So I don't really think that this is a 220
22 million dollar cost to the tax payers. If this
23 proceeds, I think we're looking more like a billion
24 dollar cost to the taxpayers.

25 Because we have already heard from the woman

PUBLIC HEARING- 11/4/04

1 who lives there that the main street is eroding. So we
2 know that that will have to be refurbished.

3 And we know that the old prison is in
4 significant disrepair. So I think it's really a waste
5 of taxpayers' money to spend a billion dollars on
6 something that significantly degrades our beautiful
7 environment.

8 And I do support -- I do support the
9 rehabilitation projects that are going on there. And I
10 think that would be great in the reuse plan to
11 incorporate all of those things but not have a prison
12 expansion.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. DANIELS: Thank you.

15 Next, we have Marie Hoch.

16 MS. HOCH: Thank you. It's H-o-c-h. I'm going
17 to talk about the native esthetics of the proposed new
18 prison.

19 When I take the ferry into San Francisco, it
20 travels by the prison at a very low rate of speed so
21 that it doesn't create any wake.

22 So you have a lot of time to study the prison
23 and it's frightening. It's rundown. It's poorly
24 maintained.

25 It looks like something that might have been